

REMARKS

Claims 15-19 are now pending in the application as new claims. Claims 8-10 and 12-14 have been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Additionally, pursuant to the Examiner's request, a newly executed Power of Attorney specifically listing Harness, Dickey & Pierce, PLC as attorneys of record has been requested from the client and will be forwarded to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office upon receipt.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. As Applicant has cancelled claims 12-14, the rejection is now moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

While Applicant has cancelled claims 8-10 and 12-14, effectively rendering the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 moot, Applicant offers the following discussion to explain why claims 15-19 should not be subject to a similar §103 rejection.

Claim 15 is characterized in that the gap portion and the space are linked, and oil in the gap portion flows into the space, even when the rotating table is stopped. In other words, according to claim 15, even when the rotating table is stopped, the oil for lubricating the cam and the cam followers flows into the space between the end surface of the rotating table and the opposing surface of the housing.

Additionally, the oil between the end surface of the rotating table and the opposing surface of the housing functions as a damper. In other words, according to claim 15, oscillation of the rotating table in the stopped state is attenuated promptly.

British Patent No. 608,048 (hereinafter '048) teaches that oil is in chamber 24.

However, '048 does not teach that the oil for lubricating cam and the cam followers flows into the space between the rotating table and the housing in order to damp the rotating table while the rotating table is stopped.

According to '048, the oil in the chamber 24 is supplied from an oil reservoir by the piston pump 19 that moves via the cam 18 by rotation of the wheel 2. Therefore, according to '048, when the wheel 2 stops, the chamber 24 and the oil reservoir are not linked and the oil in the oil reservoir does not flow into chamber 24.

Additionally, according to '048, the oil in the chamber 24 does not function as a damper, and the oil is used only for lubrication. This is evidenced by the fact that the plate 1 engages a ring-shaped member 8 without any play.

Therefore, with the structure of '048, oscillation of the stopped rotating table (plate 1) cannot be attenuated as in the invention as now claimed.

U.S. Patent 5,243,869 (Kukowski) and U. S. Patent 4,896,560 also do not teach that the oil for lubricating the cam and the cam followers flows into the space between the rotating table and the housing for damping the rotating table while the rotating table is stopped.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Additionally, Applicant submits that a

sufficient explanation has been presented as to why a new §103 rejection is unwarranted. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 12, 2003

By: Robert M. Siminski
Robert M. Siminski
Reg. No. 36,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
RMS/csd